

*Telemarketing Sales Rule (16 C.F.R. 310.4(b)(1)(iii)) shall not expire at the end of any specified time period.*

(b) **REINSTATEMENT.**—*The Federal Trade Commission shall reinstate the registration of any telephone number that has been removed from the registry before the date of enactment of this Act under a Federal Trade Commission rule or practice requiring the removal of a telephone number from the registry 5 years after its registration.*

(c) **REGISTRY MAINTENANCE.**—*The Federal Trade Commission may check telephone numbers listed on the do-not-call registry against national databases periodically and purge those numbers that have been disconnected and reassigned.*

Mr. DODD. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment at the desk be considered and agreed to; the committee-reported amendment, as amended, be agreed to; the bill, as amended, be read a third time, passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements related thereto be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 3867) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To require the FTC to report to the Congress on its efforts to improve the accuracy of the Do-Not-Call Registry)

At the end of the bill, add the following:

#### **SEC. 3. REPORT ON ACCURACY.**

Not later than 9 months after the enactment of this Act, the Federal Trade Commission shall report to the Congress on efforts taken by the Commission, after the date of enactment of this Act, to improve the accuracy of the “do-not-call” Registry.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The bill, as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time and passed, as follows:

S. 2096

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### **SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.**

This Act may be cited as the “Do-Not-Call Improvement Act of 2007”.

#### **SEC. 2. PROHIBITION OF EXPIRATION DATE FOR REGISTERED TELEPHONE NUMBERS.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The registration of a telephone number on the do-not-call registry of the Telemarketing Sales Rule (16 C.F.R. 310.4(b)(1)(iii)) shall not expire at the end of any specified time period.

(b) **REINSTATEMENT.**—The Federal Trade Commission shall reinstate the registration of any telephone number that has been removed from the registry before the date of enactment of this Act under a Federal Trade Commission rule or practice requiring the removal of a telephone number from the registry 5 years after its registration.

(c) **REGISTRY MAINTENANCE.**—The Federal Trade Commission may check telephone numbers listed on the do-not-call registry against national databases periodically and purge those numbers that have been disconnected and reassigned.

#### **SEC. 3. REPORT ON ACCURACY.**

Not later than 9 months after the enactment of this Act, the Federal Trade Commission shall report to the Congress on efforts taken by the Commission, after the date of enactment of this Act, to improve the accuracy of the “do-not-call” Registry.

#### **COURT SECURITY IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2007**

Mr. DODD. I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 660, and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 660) to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect judges, prosecutors, witnesses, victims, and their family members, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, at the very beginning of this Congress, one of the very first actions I took was to reintroduce the Court Security Improvement Act of 2007, along with Senators REID, SPECTER, DURBIN, CORNYN, KENNEDY, HATCH, SCHUMER and COLLINS. The Judiciary Committee considered this important legislation, and recommended it to the full Senate. When Majority Leader REID wanted to move to consider it, he could not get a time agreement. We were forced to dedicate almost a week of precious floor time to overcome a Republican objection, just to proceed to debate on the bill. Eventually, the measure passed by a 97 to 0 vote. Not a single Senator voted against it. A short time later, a nearly identical bill passed the House by a voice vote. Despite the broad bipartisan support for both bills, however, we were blocked from going to conference to resolve the minor differences between them by an anonymous hold placed by a Republican Senator. For months, we negotiated the minor differences between the House and Senate versions of this legislation.

When we are responding to attacks and threats on our Federal judges, witnesses and officers, time is of the essence. Just last month in Nevada, a man admitted to shooting and injuring the family court judge who was presiding over his divorce. This type of violence against our judiciary can and must be prevented. For our justice system to function effectively, our judges and other court personnel must be safe and secure. They and their families must be free from the fear of retaliation and harassment. Witnesses who come forward must be protected, and the courthouses where our laws are enforced must be secure. Today, almost eleven months after introducing this legislation, we may actually reach consent to pass a compromise version that will pass the House and be sent to the President.

We must act now to get these protections in place and stop delaying such protective measures by anonymous holds. I urge Senators to take up and pass this compromise version of the Court Security Improvement Act so that we can provide the necessary protections that our Federal courts so desperately need. The security of our Federal judges and our courthouses around the Nation is at stake.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I rise today to comment on H.R. 660, the Court Security Improvement Act of 2007. Section 509 of the final substitute transfers one seat from the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit. The reasons for this change are explained in Senator FEINSTEIN's and my additional views in S. Rept. 110-42.

Section 102 of the bill authorizes the U.S. Marshals Service to provide protection to the U.S. Tax Court, and stipulates that the Marshals Service retains final authority regarding the Tax Court's security needs. The Tax Court has expressed concern to me and to other Members that the Marshals Service should consult with the Tax Court about the costs that it expects to incur for providing security—costs that will be charged to the Tax Court. The Marshals Service has assured Congress that it will consult with the Tax Court on these matters and that it will not surprise the Tax Court with charges that the court may have difficulty paying. Rather than include heavy-handed consultation requirements in the text of the legislation, we have agreed to adopt the bill in its current form on the strength of these assurances.

Section 202 of the bill makes it an offense to disseminate sensitive personal information about Federal police officers and criminal informants and witnesses. The final version extends this offense to also protect State law enforcement officers, but only to the extent that their participation in Federal activities creates a Federal interest sufficient to maintain this provision's consistency with principles of federalism.

Section 207 increases statutory maximum penalties for manslaughter under section 1112 of title 18. I expect the U.S. Sentencing Commission to revise its guidelines for these offenses in light of these new higher statutory maxima. I commented on the need for these changes when the Senate version of this bill passed the Senate earlier this year and would refer interested parties to those remarks and especially to Paul Charlton's testimony, at 153 CONG. REC. S4739-4741, daily ed. April 19, 2007.

Section 208 increases the penalties for retaliatory assaults against Federal judges' family members. This provision also clarifies an assault offense that was created by Congress in 1994. The offense establishes penalties for simple assault, assault with bodily injury, and for assault in “all other cases.” As one might imagine, the meaning of assault in “all other cases” has been the subject of confusion and judicial debate. The offense has also been the subject of constant vagueness challenges, and although those legal challenges have been rejected, the offense is rather vague. Section 208 takes the opportunity to correct this legislative sin, codifying what I believe is the most thoughtful explanation of what this

language means, the 10th Circuit's decision in *United States v. Hathaway*, 318 F.3d 1001, 1008–09, 10th Cir. 2003. A conforming change has also been made to section III of title 18, so that sections 111 and 115 will match each other and, again, so that people can easily figure out what this offense actually proscribes.

Section 503 of the bill guarantees that senior district judges may elect to participate in court rulemaking, appointment of magistrates and court officers, and other administrative matters, so long as such judges carry at least half of the caseload of an active district judge. I believe that this provision is a bad idea, though its negative consequences have been greatly mitigated in this final substitute as a result of the intervention of Senator SESSIONS. Many senior judges are often not present at the courthouse and are disengaged from the work of the court and the life of the court. Moreover, Congress has no business telling the courts how to manage these types of internal organizational matters. Those jurists who share my objection to this provision should be grateful to Senator SESSIONS, who insisted that the provision be limited to district judges as opposed to circuit judges, that a senior judge be required to elect to exercise these functions, and that a senior judge carry at least half of a full caseload in order to be entitled to assume these powers.

Finally, section 511 adds nomenclature to section 2255 of title 28, a change recommended to me by Kent Scheidegger of the Criminal Justice Legal Foundation. This change has no substantive effect but should make this code section easier for litigants to cite.

Mr. DODD. I ask unanimous consent that a Leahy substitute amendment at the desk be agreed to; the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed; the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate, and any statements related to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 3868) was agreed to.

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Text of Amendments.")

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill read a third time.

The bill (H.R. 660), as amended, was read the third time and passed.

#### U.S. CAPITOL POLICE AND LIBRARY OF CONGRESS POLICE MERGER IMPLEMENTATION ACT OF 2007

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 3690, just received from the House and at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3690) to provide for the transfer of the Library of Congress police to the United States Capitol Police, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

#### RIGHTS AND PROTECTIONS

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I appreciate the work by my colleague, Senator FEINSTEIN, who chairs the Committee on Rules and Administration, and by other Senators over many years to accomplish this merger of the U.S. Capitol Police and the Library of Congress Police.

The U.S. Capitol Police and Library of Congress Police Merger and Implementation Act of 2007 provides that employees of the Library of Congress Police shall be transferred to the United States Capitol Police. I would like to ask my colleague Senator FEINSTEIN about provisions under which the Chief of the U.S. Capitol Police will make certain final determinations regarding the incoming Library of Congress Police employees that shall not be appealable or reviewable in any manner. It is my understanding that these provisions would generally prevent individuals from appealing or seeking review of the determinations of the Chief of the U.S. Capitol Police, but would not limit the right of any individual to seek any appropriate relief under the Congressional Accountability Act if these determinations by the Chief allegedly violated that act.

The Congressional Accountability Act was enacted in 1995 to provide to congressional employees the same rights and protections that are available to other employees in our Nation, including protection against discrimination on the basis of race, sex, national origin, religion, or age. My understanding is that the merger legislation would in no way limit the right of any employee covered under the Congressional Accountability Act to initiate an action regarding any alleged violation of rights protected under that Act. I have also been told that this interpretation of the legislation is shared by the Chief of the U.S. Capitol Police, and that Library of Congress employees transferring to the U.S. Capitol Police will be informed and educated about their rights and protections under the Congressional Accountability Act.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. The understanding of my colleague from Connecticut, Senator LIEBERMAN, is correct. The finality provisions in this legislation were intended to give the Chief of the U.S. Capitol Police authority to transfer employees and assign duties as necessary to meet the mission of the U.S. Capitol Police in maintaining the security of the Capitol complex. However, the provisions in this legislation in no way limit the protections and rights of an employee to seek relief under the Congressional Accountability Act.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. I thank the Senator for her assistance and courtesy.

Mr. DODD. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment at the desk be

considered and agreed to; the bill, as amended, be read a third time, passed, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table; that any statements relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD without further intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 3869) was agreed to.

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Text of Amendments.")

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H.R. 3690) was read the third time and passed.

#### NATIONAL TEEN DATING VIOLENCE AWARENESS AND PREVENTION WEEK

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 541, S. Res. 388.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 388) designating the week of February 4 through February 8, 2008, as "National Teen Dating Violence Awareness and Prevention Week."

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 388) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

#### S. RES. 388

Whereas 1 in 3 female teenagers in a dating relationship has feared for her physical safety;

Whereas 1 in 2 teenagers in a serious relationship has compromised personal beliefs to please a partner;

Whereas 1 in 5 teenagers in a serious relationship reports having been hit, slapped, or pushed by a partner;

Whereas 27 percent of teenagers have been in dating relationships in which their partners called them names or put them down;

Whereas 29 percent of girls who have been in a relationship said that they have been pressured to have sex or to engage in sexual activities that they did not want;

Whereas technologies such as cell phones and the Internet have made dating abuse both more pervasive and more hidden;

Whereas 30 percent of teenagers who have been in a dating relationship say that they have been text-messaged between 10 and 30 times per hour by a partner seeking to find out where they are, what they are doing, or who they are with;

Whereas 72 percent of teenagers who reported they'd been checked up on by a boyfriend or girlfriend 10 times per hour by email or text messaging did not tell their parents;